

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

ISRAEL C. MENDEZ, #01679093,	§
	§
Petitioner,	§
	§
v.	§ Case No. 6:19-cv-320-JDK-KNM
	§
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID,	§
	§
Respondent.	§

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Petitioner Israel C. Mendez, a Texas Department of Criminal Justice inmate proceeding pro se, filed this federal petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The petition was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.

On April 13, 2022, Judge Mitchell issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the Court deny the petition and dismiss this case with prejudice. Judge Mitchell also recommended that a certificate of appealability be denied. Docket No. 17. Petitioner timely objected. Docket No. 19.

Where a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation, the Court reviews the objected-to findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en*

banc), superseded on other grounds by statute, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

In his objections, Petitioner argues that he is not seeking relief on his underlying conviction but is challenging his prison disciplinary case conviction for possessing contraband. He maintains that the prison disciplinary proceeding “unconstitutionally deprived” him of his personal property. Docket No. 19 at 2.

But objections that simply rehash or mirror the underlying claims addressed in the Report are not entitled to de novo review. *See U.S. v. Morales*, 947 F. Supp.2d 166, 171 (D.P.R. 2013) (“Even though timely objections to a report and recommendation entitle the objecting party to *de novo* review of the findings, ‘the district court should be spared the chore of traversing ground already plowed by the Magistrate.’”) (internal citations omitted); *see also Vega v. Artuz*, 2002 WL 31174466 *1 (S.D. NY Sep. 2002) (unpublished) (“However, objections that are merely perfunctory responses argued in an attempt to engage the district court in a rehashing of the same arguments set forth in the original petition will not suffice to invoke *de novo* review of the magistrate judge’s recommendations.”). Here, Petitioner’s objections to Judge Mitchell’s Report and Recommendation are an attempt to rehash his habeas claims and fail to address the substance of the Report.

Having conducted a de novo review of the Report and the record in this case, the Court has determined that the Report of the United States Magistrate Judge is correct, and Petitioner’s objections are without merit. The Court therefore **OVERRULES** Petitioner’s objections (Docket No. 19) and **ADOPTS** the Report and

Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 17) as the opinion of the District Court. Petitioner's petition for habeas corpus is hereby **DISMISSED** with prejudice. Further, the Court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this 12th day of May, 2022.



JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE